

45

<b>Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/759,575	<b>Applicant(s)</b> DURNEY, MAX W.	
	<b>Examiner</b> Shelley Self	<b>Art Unit</b> 3725	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

- (1) Shelley Self. (3) Victor Johnson.  
 (2) Robert Chickering. (4) \_\_\_\_.

Date of Interview: 13 May 2004.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference

c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☐ No.

If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) discussed: 1, 12 and 30.

Identification of prior art discussed: Durney, Thompson references.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.



**ALLEN OSTRAGER  
 SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
 TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3700**

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

\_\_\_\_\_  
 Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Discussed the "substantially greater" shank portion for an interference fit between the fastener and the bore. Also discussed that Thompson teaches away from this and describes an interference-free fit. Claims 1 and 12 and their dependencies are drawn to this feature. Regarding claim 30, discussed the oblong shape of the bore, it's benefits as a means to limit splitting of the wood/work piece when the shank/fastener is driven into the bore of the work piece. The structure discussed is presented in preliminary amendment, filed 1/16/04. The prior art references, Durney and Thompson are those of record in the parent case, 09/919,182.